arXiv:1512.01781v1 [cs.DS] 6 Dec 2015

k-Trails: Recognition, Complexity, and Approximations

Mohit Singh* Rico Zenklusen†

December 8, 2015

Abstract

The notion of degree-constrained spanning hierarchies, also called k-trails, was recently introduced in the context of network routing problems. They describe graphs that are homomorphic images of connected graphs of degree at most k. First results highlight several interesting advantages of k-trails compared to previous routing approaches. However, so far, only little is known regarding computational aspects of k-trails.

In this work we aim to fill this gap by presenting how k-trails can be analyzed using techniques from algorithmic matroid theory. Exploiting this connection, we resolve several open questions about k-trails. In particular, we show that one can recognize efficiently whether a graph is a k-trail. Furthermore, we show that deciding whether a graph contains a k-trail is NP-complete; however, every graph that contains a k-trail is a $(k+1)$-trail. Moreover, further leveraging the connection to matroids, we consider the problem of finding a minimum weight k-trail contained in a graph G. We show that one can efficiently find a $(2k-1)$-trail contained in G whose weight is no more than the cheapest k-trail contained in G, even when allowing negative weights.

The above results settle several open questions raised by Mólnar, Newman, and Sebő.

1 Introduction

Motivated by applications in network routing, the notion of *degree-constrained spanning hierarchies* was introduced as a way to obtain lower-degree routing structures as what could be obtained with low-degree spanning subgraphs [6]. These hierarchies, which, for brevity, have also simply be called *k-trails* [9, 7], describe how a given graph can be described as the homomorphic image of another low-degree graph. First results have already been reported that show advantages of k-trails compared to traditional methods in network routing contexts [6]. However, many basic questions around k-trails remained open, including whether one can efficiently decide if a graph is a k-trail; we refer the interested reader to [9] for a nice overview of some open problems around k-trails. The goal of this work is to fill this gap by answering several basic open questions about k-trails, by revealing and exploiting a connection to matroids.

Before giving a summary of our main results, we start by formally defining k-trails as well as some closely related notions. In particular, the notion of homomorphic images introduced below is the basis for defining k-trails.

Throughout this paper, we focus on undirected connected graphs with possibly loops and parallel edges, and with at least 2 vertices to avoid trivial special cases.

*Microsoft Research, Redmond, USA. Email: mohits@microsoft.com .

†ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland. Email: ricoz@math.ethz.ch .

Definition 1 (homomorphic image)**.** *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is the* homomorphic image *of a graph $H = (W, F)$ if there is an onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that for any two vertices $u, v \in V$ (with possibly $u = v$), the number of edges in G between u and v is equal to the number of edges in H whose endpoints get mapped by ϕ to $\{u, v\}$.*



$G = (V, E)$ $H_1 = (W_1, F_1)$ $H_2 = (W_2, F_2)$

Figure 1: The graph G is the homomorphic image of H_1 as well as H_2. The naming of the vertices has been chosen to highlight the corresponding homomorphisms, e.g., the nodes 3a and 3b in H_1 are both mapped to node 3 in G. G is a 3-trail, because the homomorphic preimage H_2 has maximum degree 3.

Figure 1 shows an example graph and 2 homomorphic preimages of it.

Hence, a preimage $H = (W, F)$ of G corresponds to a graph obtained from G by splitting each of its vertices $v \in V$ into $|\phi^{-1}(v)|$ many copies. We therefore call $|\phi^{-1}(v)|$ the *ϕ-multiplicity*, or simply *multiplicity*, of v.

Definition 2 (k-trail)**.** *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a k-trail if it is the homomorphic image of a connected graph $H = (W, F)$ with maximum degree at most k.*

The graph G shown in Figure 1 is a 3-trail since it is the homomorphic image of H_2, which has maximum degree 3.

It is not hard to see that k-trails can equivalently be defined as preimages of trees of degree at most k.

Definition 3 (k-tree)**.** *A graph is a k-tree if it is a spanning tree of maximum degree at most k.*

Lemma 1.1. *If G is a k-trail then it is a homomorphic image of a k-tree. More precisely, given a connected graph $H = (W, F)$ and onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that G is the homomorphic image of H by ϕ, we can construct efficiently a tree $H' = (W', F')$ and onto function $\phi' : W' \to W$ such that H is the homomorphic image of H' by ϕ'. Thus, G is the $\phi' \circ \phi$-homomorphic image of H', and for $v \in V$, the $\phi' \circ \phi$-multiplicity of $v \in V$ is at least the ϕ-multiplicity of v.*

Proof. Let G be a homomorphic image of the connected graph $H = (W, F)$ with maximum degree k. We show how vertices of H can be split step-by-step to arrive at H'. We only show a single splitting step transforming H into $\bar{H} = (\bar{W}, \bar{F})$. Assume that H contains a cycle, say C; otherwise we can set $H' = H$. Let $\{w_1, w_2\}$ be an edge in C. Let $\bar{W} = W \cup \{x\}$ where x is a new vertex. Let $\bar{H} = (\bar{W}, \bar{F})$ where $\bar{F} = F \cup \{\{x, w_1\}\} \setminus \{\{w_1, w_2\}\}$ and $\bar{\phi} : \bar{W} \to W$ where $\bar{\phi}(w) = w$ if $w \in W$ and $\bar{\phi}(x) = w_2$. Clearly $\bar{H}$ is connected with maximum degree k and H is a homomorphic image of $\bar{H}$ by $\bar{\phi}$. Since $\bar{H}$ has one more vertex than H, repeatedly applying this procedure will stop as soon as we split G into a connected graph with $|E| - 1$ vertices, in which case it has to be a tree H'. □

Many basic questions on k-trails remained open. This includes the complexity status of deciding whether a graph is a k-trail for a given k, an open question raised in [9]. Further interesting open questions on k-trails that are motivated by routing applications are linked to the notion of whether a graph *contains* a k-trail, which is defined as follows.

Definition 4 (containing a k-trail)**.** *We say that a graph $G = (V, E)$* contains a k-trail *if there is a set $U \subseteq E$ such that $G' = (V, U)$ is a k-trail.*

Notice that all k-trails are connected graphs, since they are homomorphic images of connected graphs. Hence, candidate edge sets $U \subseteq E$, for $G = (V, E)$ to contain a k-trail (V, U), must be such that (V, U) is connected.

Regarding the containment of k-trails, many interesting questions remained open [9]. This includes the complexity status of deciding whether a graph contains a k-trail, and questions related to approximation algorithms for finding minimum weight k-trails. In particular, it was conjectured in [9] that for any nonnegative edge weights $w : E \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and any $k \geq 3$, there exists a polynomial algorithm returning a $(2k-2)$-trail in G whose cost is not larger than the minimum weight k-trail in G, if G contains a k-trail.

In this paper we are able to settle most of the above-mentioned open questions, by presenting a new viewpoint on k-trails in terms of matroids.

1.1 Our results

One of our main results, whose derivation will also be used to highlight a strong link between k-trails and matroids, is the fact that k-trails can be recognized efficiently.

Theorem 1.2. *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, it can be checked efficiently whether G is a k-trail, and if so, obtain a k-tree $H = (W, F)$ and onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that G is the homomorphic image of H by ϕ.*

Contrary to the recognition problem, the containment problem is hard.

Theorem 1.3. *For any $k \geq \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, the problem of deciding whether a graph contains a k-trail is* NP*-complete.*

Despite the different complexity status of the containment and recognition question, the following theorem shows that they are closely related.

Theorem 1.4. *If G contains a k-trail then it is a $(k+1)$-trail.*

In particular, the above theorem implies that if a graph G contains a k-trail, we can efficiently find a $(k+1)$-trail contained in G, namely the graph itself. Using the fact that recognition is polynomial time solvable, we can thus find the smallest k for which a given graph G is a k-trail, which then implies by Theorem 1.4 that the smallest k' for which G contains a k'-trail is either k or $k-1$.

Finally, we obtain the following result on the containment of weighted k-trails.

Theorem 1.5. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with weight function $w : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ and an integer $k \geq 2$, either shows that there is no k-trail contained in G or returns a $(2k-1)$-trail contained in G whose total weight is at most the weight of any k-trail contained in G.*

Theorem 1.5 almost resolves a conjecture in [9], claiming that one can find a $(2k-2)$-trail in G of weight upper bounded by the weight of any k-trail contained in G, assuming $k \geq 3$ and that the weights w are nonnegative. Our result only implies the existence of a cheap $(2k-1)$-trail; however, it holds for arbitrary weights, and not just nonnegative ones. Furthermore, we can show that, for arbitrary weights, the factor $2k-1$ is optimal when comparing to a natural LP relaxation.

Organization of paper

Section 2 proves Theorem 1.2 and shows how k-trails can be studied using tools from algorithmic matroid theory. Section 3 discusses hardness proof for Theorem 1.3 as well as the algorithm for Theorem 1.4. In Section 3.1, we give the algorithm for Theorem 1.5.

Basic terminology

The degree of a vertex $v \in V$ in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is denoted by $\deg_G(v)$, or simply $\deg(v)$ if there is no danger of confusion. If the graph is clear from context, we will also use the notation $\deg_U(v) := |\delta(v) \cap U|$ for a set $U \subseteq E$ and $v \in V$.

2 Recognition of k-trails

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and assume we want to show that G is a k-trail for k as small as possible. Consider some tree $H = (W, F)$ such that G is the homomorphic image of G by some onto function $\phi : W \to V$. Let $v \in V$ and consider all vertices of H that get mapped to v, i.e., $\phi^{-1}(v) = \{w_1, \ldots, w_\ell\}$, where $\ell = |\phi^{-1}(v)|$ is the multiplicity of v. Clearly, we have

$$\deg_G(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \deg_H(w_i).$$

Knowing that v gets split into ℓ vertices by ϕ, for degrees to be low in H it would be best if all w_i for $i \in [\ell]$ have about the same degree. It turns out that starting with any H and corresponding ϕ, we can balance out the degrees of vertices in H that correspond to the same vertex in G, using a simple modification algorithm. The following lemma formalizes this statement.

Lemma 2.1. *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a tree $H = (W, F)$, and an onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that G is the homomorphic image of H, one can determine in polynomial time a tree $H' = (W, F')$ such that*

(i) G is the homomorphic image of H' by ϕ.

(ii) For any $v \in V$ and $w \in W$ such that $\phi(w) = v$, the degree of w in H' is either $\left\lfloor \frac{\deg_G(v)}{|\phi^{-1}(v)|} \right\rfloor$ or $\left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{|\phi^{-1}(v)|} \right\rceil$.

Proof. We show that there exists a tree $H' = (W, F')$ such that for each vertex $v \in V$, and $w, w' \in \phi^{-1}(v)$, we have $|\deg_{H'}(w) - \deg_{H'}(w')| \leq 1$. The lemma then follows naturally. Suppose that $H = (W, F)$ does not satisfy the condition. Thus for some $v \in V$ and $w, w' \in \phi^{-1}(v)$, we have $\deg_H(w) \geq 2 + \deg_H(w')$. Let u be a neighbor of w that does not lie on the unique path from w to w' in H. Since the degree of w is at least three, such a neighbor always exists. Now, we construct a $\hat{H} = (W, \hat{F})$ where we let $\hat{F} = F \cup \{\{u, w'\}\} \setminus \{\{u, w\}\}$. It is straightforward to see that $\hat{H}$ is a

tree and G is also an homomorphic image of $\hat{H}$. We now repeat this operation as long as we can find such a pair of vertices. Observe that $\sum_{u \in W} \deg_{\hat{H}}(u)^2 < \sum_{u \in W} \deg_H(u)^2$ and thus a potential argument implies that the sequence is polynomially bounded. Thus the tree obtained at the end of the sequence, $H' = (W, F')$, satisfies the conditions of the lemma. □

We leverage the above lemma to rephrase the problem of whether a graph is a k-trail in terms of multiplicities.

Definition 5 (feasible multiplicity vector)**.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{>0}$ is a* feasible multiplicity vector *(for G) if G is the homomorphic image of a connected graph with multiplicities given by λ; more formally, if there is a connected graph $H = (W, F)$ such that G is the homomorphic image of H by some onto function $\phi : W \to V$, and $|\phi^{-1}(v)| = \lambda(v) \ \ \forall v \in V$.*

Feasible multiplicity vectors fulfill the following down-monotonicity property.

Lemma 2.2. *Let G be a graph and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{>0}$ be a feasible multiplicity vector. Then any vector $\lambda' \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{>0}$ with $\lambda' \leq \lambda$ (component-wise) is also a feasible multiplicity vector.*

Furthermore, this result is constructive: Given a connected graph H and homomorphism ϕ such that G is the ϕ-homomorphic image of H and λ is the multiplicity vector corresponding to ϕ, we can efficiently construct for any $\lambda' \leq \lambda$ a connected graph H' and homomorphism ϕ' such that G is the ϕ'-homomorphic image of H' with corresponding multiplicity vector λ'.

Proof. Given a feasible vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{>0}$ with $\lambda(v) \geq 2$, we show that $\bar{\lambda}$ is also a feasible vector where $\bar{\lambda}(v) = \lambda(v) - 1$ and $\bar{\lambda}(u) = \lambda(u)$ for each $u \in V \setminus \{v\}$. The lemma then follows from induction.

Let $H = (W, F)$ and $\phi : W \to V$ certify the feasibility of λ. Since $\lambda(v) \geq 2$, there exists $w_1, w_2 \in \phi^{-1}(v)$ such that $w_1 \neq w_2$. Let $H' = (W', F')$ be obtained by merging w_1 and w_2 into a new vertex w. Thus $W' = W \cup \{w\} \setminus \{w_1, w_2\}$. Let $\phi' : W' \to V$ where $\phi'(w) = v$ and $\phi'(x) = \phi(x)$ for each $x \in W' \setminus \{w\}$. Then G is a homomorphic image of H' by ϕ' and H' certifies the feasibility of $\bar{\lambda}$, thus proving the lemma. □

Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 easily imply that the question of whether G is a k-trail for some given k can be reduced to the problem of deciding whether some multiplicity vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{>0}$ is feasible.

Lemma 2.3. *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a k-trail if and only if the following multiplicity vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{>0}$ is feasible:*

$$\lambda(v) = \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{k} \right\rceil \qquad \forall v \in V.$$

Proof. Let G be a k-trail witnessed by H and ϕ. Since H has maximum degree k, we must have $\phi^{-1}(v) \geq \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{k} \right\rceil$ proving the only if direction.

Now, let λ be feasible where $\lambda(v) = \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{k} \right\rceil$ for each $v \in V$. From Lemma 2.1, it follows that G is a homomorphic image of a connected graph $H = (W, F)$ by $\phi : W \to V$ such that $\deg_H(w) \leq \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{\lambda(v)} \right\rceil$ for each $w \in \phi^{-1}(v)$. Since $\left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{\lambda(v)} \right\rceil \leq k$, the lemma follows. □

To finally provide an efficient recognition algorithm to decide whether a graph is a k-trail, we show that feasible multiplicity vectors are highly structured.

Notice that a feasible multiplicity vector is at least 1 in each coordinate. For simplicity, we introduce a shifted version of feasible multiplicity vectors, called *feasible split vector*; a vector $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$ is a feasible split vector if $\mu + \mathbf{1}$ is a feasible multiplicity vector, where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{Z}^V$ is the all-ones vector. Hence, a split vector tells us how many times a vertex is split.

Theorem 2.4. *Let G be an undirected graph. The set of feasible split vectors correspond to the integral points of a polymatroid* [1]*, i.e.,*

$$P_G := \text{conv}(\{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0} \mid \mu \text{ is a feasible split vector}\}),$$

is a polymatroid.

Furthermore, we can efficiently optimize over P_G, and for any feasible split vector $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$ we can efficiently find a connected graph $H = (W, F)$ and an onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that G is the homomorphic image of H, and $|\phi^{-1}(v)| = \mu(v)$ $\forall v \in V$.

Before proving the theorem, we start with a few observations and show that Theorem 2.4 implies Theorem 1.2.

It is well-known that P_G being a polymatroid implies that P_G is given by

$$P_G = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^V_{\geq 0} \mid x(S) \leq f(S)\ \forall S \subseteq V\},$$

where $f : 2^V \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is the submodular function defined by

$$f(S) = \max\{x(S) \mid x \in P_G\} \qquad S \subseteq V.$$

Many results on polymatroids typically assume that a polymatroid is given through a value oracle for the function f. Clearly, if we can efficiently optimize over P_G, we can also evaluate efficiently the submodular function f, which, as described above, corresponds to maximizing a $\{0,1\}$-objective over P_G.

We are particularly interested in checking whether some split vector $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$ is feasible. Having an efficient evaluation oracle for f allows for checking whether $\mu \in P_G$ by standard procedures: It suffices to solve the submodular function minimization problem $\min\{f(S) - x(S) \mid S \subseteq V\}$; if the optimal value is negative then $\mu \notin P_G$, otherwise $\mu \in P_G$. We will later see that the link between k-trails and matroids that we establish implies an easy way to check whether $\mu \in P_G$ using a simple matroid intersection problem (without relying on submodular function minimization).

Combining the above results and observations, Theorem 1.2 easily follows.

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{>0}$ be defined as in Lemma 2.3, and let $\mu = \lambda - \mathbf{1}$. Lemma 2.3—rephrased in terms of μ—states that G is a k-trail if and only if μ is a feasible split vector, which can be checked efficiently by Theorem 2.4. Furthermore, if μ is feasible, then Theorem 2.4 also shows that we can efficiently obtain a graph $\bar{H} = (W, \bar{F})$ and onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that

(i) G is the homomorphic image of $\bar{H}$ by ϕ, and
(ii) $|\phi^{-1}(v)| = \mu(v) + 1 \quad \forall v \in V$.

[1] A polymatroid over a finite set N is a polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N_{\geq 0}$ described by $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N_{\geq 0} \mid x(S) \leq f(S)\ \forall S \subseteq N\}$, where $f : 2^N \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is a submodular function. We refer the interested reader to [8, Volume B] for more information on polymatroids.

By Lemma 2.1 we can balance the degrees of $\bar{H}$ for each vertex set $\phi^{-1}(v)$ efficiently, to obtain a graph $H = (W, F)$ with balanced degrees as stated in Lemma 2.1. It remains to observe that H is indeed a k-tree. This indeed holds: let $w \in W$ and $v = \phi(w)$; we thus obtain

$$\deg_H(w) \leq \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{|\phi^{-1}(v)|} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{\mu(v)+1} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{\left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{k} \right\rceil} \right\rceil \leq \left\lceil \frac{\deg_G(v)}{\frac{\deg_G(v)}{k}} \right\rceil = k \ ,$$

where the first inequality follows by Lemma 2.1 and the second equality by $\mu(v) + 1 = \lambda(v) = \lceil \deg_G(v)/k \rceil$. □

Matroidal description of k-trails and proof of Theorem 2.4

We start by introducing an auxiliary graph $G' = (V', E')$ such that spanning trees in G' can be interpreted as graphs H such that G is a homomorphic image of H. Using this connection, we then derive that P_G is a polymatroid over which we can optimize efficiently, and show how to construct a homomorphic preimage of G corresponding to some split vector μ, as claimed by Theorem 2.4.

Hence, let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph. The graph $G' = (V', E')$ contains a vertex for each of the two endpoints of each edge in E. More formally, for each $v \in V$, the Graph G' contains $\deg_G(v)$ many vertices $V'_v := \{v_e\}_{e \in \delta(v)}$; hence,

$$V' = \bigcup_{v \in V} V'_v.$$

We note that describing V'_v by $\{v_e\}_{e \in \delta(v)}$ is a slight abuse of notation, since for also for each loop at v we include two vertices in V'_v and not just one.

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} E' &= \bar{E} \cup K, \quad \text{where} \\ \bar{E} &= \{\{v_e, u_e\} \mid e = \{u, v\} \in E\}, \quad \text{and} \\ K &= \bigcup_{v \in V} K_v, \quad \text{where} \\ K_v &= \{\{v_e, v_f\} \mid v_e, v_f \in V'_v, v_e \neq v_f\} \quad \forall v \in V. \end{aligned}$$

See Figure 2 for an example of the above construction.

For any spanning tree $T \subseteq E'$ in G' that contains $\overline{E}$, we define a graph $H_T = (W_T, F_T)$ and an onto function $\phi_T : W_T \to V$, such that G is the homomorphic image of H_T by ϕ, as follows. Let $K_T = T \cap K = T \setminus \overline{E}$. For each $v \in V$ consider the connected components of (V'_v, K_v). Let q_v be the number of these connected components and let

$$V'_v = C_v^1 \cup C_v^2 \cup \cdots \cup C_v^{q_v}$$

be the partition of V'_v into vertex sets of the q_v connected components in (V'_v, K_v).

We now define $H_T = (W_T, F_T)$ as the graph obtained from G' by contracting all C_v^j for $v \in V$ and $j \in [q_v] := \{1, \ldots, q_v\}$. For clarity, we call the vertices in H_T *nodes*. Contracting C_v^j corresponds



Figure 2: An example for the construction of the auxiliary graph $G' = (V', E')$ from $G = (V, E)$. In G' the thick edges correspond to edges in $\bar{E}$ and the thin ones to edges in K. The dashed gray circles correspond to the cliques (V'_v, K_v) and highlight the link between the vertices $v \in V$ in G and vertex sets V'_v in G' which correspond to v.

to replacing C_v^j with a single node, which we identify with the set C_v^j for simplicity, thus leading to the following set of nodes for H_T:

$$W_T = \{C_v^j \mid v \in V, j \in [q_v]\}.$$

Furthermore, two nodes $C_v^j, C_w^\ell \in W_T$ are adjacent if and only if there is a pair of vertices, one in C_v^j and one in C_w^ℓ, that are connected by an edge in $T \cap \bar{E}$; formally, this corresponds to the existence of $e \in E$ such that that edge in $\bar{E}$ that corresponds to e is in T, and $v_e \in C_v^j$ and $w_e \in C_w^\ell$. Moreover, $\phi_T : W_T \to V$ is defined by

$$\phi_T(C_v^j) = v \quad \forall\, C_v^j \in W_T.$$

Figure 3 shows an example construction of H_T from a spanning tree T that contains $\bar{E}$.

We start with some observations that follow immediately from the above construction:

- G is the homomorphic image of H_T by ϕ_T.
- The multiplicity of $v \in V$ is q_v.
- G' can be constructed efficiently from G.
- Several spanning trees T can lead to the same graph H_T and homomorphism ϕ_T; indeed, for any component C_v^j, the edges of T with both endpoints in C_v^j form a spanning tree over C_v^j, which can be replaced by any other spanning tree without changing H_T or ϕ_T.

Conversely, every description of G as a homomorphic image of a tree can be obtained by the above construction:

Claim 1. *Let $H = (W, F)$ be a tree and $\phi : W \to V$ be an onto function such that G is the homomorphic image of H by ϕ. Then there exists a spanning tree T in G' such that $H = H_T$ and $\phi = \phi_T$.*



(V', T) $\qquad\qquad$ $H_T = (W_T, F_T)$

Figure 3: On the left-hand side, a spanning tree T in the auxiliary graph $G' = (V', E')$, that corresponds to the graph G shown in Figure 2, is highlighted. On the right-hand side, the corresponding graph H_T is shown. The homomorphism $\phi_T : W_T \to V$ maps all vertices of H_T within the same dashed circle to the same vertex of G.

Proof. Indeed, the spanning tree T can be chosen as follows. Starting with $T = \emptyset$, we first add to T all edges in $\bar{E}$. For each $w \in W$, we do the following: Let $v = \phi(w)$, and let $e_1, \dots, e_h \in E$ be the ϕ-images of the edges $\delta_H(w)$; in particular, $e_1, \dots, e_h \in \delta_G(v)$. We add to T an arbitrary set of $h - 1$ edges of G' that form a spanning tree over the vertices $v_{e_1}, \dots, v_{e_h}$. One can now easily observe that the constructed tree T has the desired properties. □

The equivalence between (ii) and (iii) in the following statement summarizes the above discussion. The equivalence between (i) and (ii) follows from Lemma 1.1 (implying (i) ⇒ (ii)) and Lemma 2.2 (implying (ii) ⇒ (i)).

Property 1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$. The following two statements are equivalent:*

(i) G is the homomorphic image of a connected graph $H = (W, F)$ by an onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that $|\phi^{-1}(v)| = \mu(v) + 1 \ \forall v \in V$.

(ii) G is the homomorphic image of a tree $H = (V, W)$ by an onto function $\phi : W \to V$ such that $|\phi^{-1}(v)| \geq \mu(v) + 1 \ \forall v \in V$.

(iii) There is a spanning tree T in the auxiliary graph $G' = (V', E')$ such that $\bar{E} \subseteq T$ and $|T \cap K_v| \leq |\delta(v)| - 1 - \mu(v) \ \forall v \in V$.

Furthermore, we highlight that the equivalences in Property 1 are all constructive.

Using the above connection between the auxiliary graph G' and homomorphic preimages of G, Theorem 2.4 can now be derived as follows. For brevity, we use the following notation. For any spanning tree T in G' such that $\bar{E} \subseteq T$, we define $\alpha_T \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$ by $\alpha_T(v) := |T \cap K_v| \ \forall v \in V$. Furthermore, let $\deg \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$ be the degree vector of G, i.e., $\deg(v)$ is the degree of v as usual. The equivalence between point (i) and point (iii) of Property 1 can thus be rephrased as follows.

$$\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0} \text{ is a feasible split vector} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \exists \text{ spanning tree } T \text{ in } G' \text{ with } \bar{E} \subseteq T \text{ and} \\ \alpha_T \leq \deg -\mathbf{1} - \mu, \end{array} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{Z}^V$ is the all-ones vector.

The equivalence highlighted by (1) directly leads to an efficient way to check whether a given vector $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$ is a feasible split vector, and if so, obtain a homomorphic preimage of G that certifies it. Indeed, finding a spanning tree T in G' that contains $\bar{E}$ and satisfies $\alpha_T \leq \deg -\mathbf{1} - \mu$ is a matroid intersection problem. More precisely, the task is to find a spanning tree in $G'/\bar{E}$ (the graph G' after contracting $\bar{E}$)—such spanning trees are the bases of the graphic matroid on $G'/\bar{E}$—whose edges are simultaneously an independent set in the partition matroid on the partition $K = \cup_{v \in V} K_v$, requiring that no more than $\deg(v) - 1 - \mu(v)$ edges are selected within K_v for each $v \in V$. If this matroid intersection problem has a solution, then we get the desired spanning tree T fulfilling the conditions of point (iii) in Property 1, which is equivalent to point (i), and this equivalence is constructive, thus leading to the desired homomorphic preimage H of G that corresponds to the split vector μ.

We finish by proving the claims about P_G in Theorem 2.4. For this, we start by observing that the vectors α_T are integral base vectors of a polymatroid.

Lemma 2.5. *The polytope*

$$\bar{B}_G = \operatorname{conv}(\{\alpha_T \mid T \text{ is a spanning tree in } G' \text{ with } \bar{E} \subseteq T\})$$

is the base polytope of a polymatroid. Furthermore, we can optimize efficiently over $\bar{B}_G$.

Proof. Let $M = (K, \mathcal{I})$ be the graphic matroid obtained by starting with the graphic matroid on G' and contracting the edges $\bar{E}$. Notice that the ground set of M is indeed K, i.e., all edges with both endpoints in one of the set V'_v for $v \in V$. Spanning trees T in G' that contain $\bar{E}$ are precisely the bases of M. Thus the vectors α_T are obtained by taking a basis in M, considering the partition $K = \cup_{v \in V} K_v$ of K, and counting the number of elements that T has in each part of this partition. This way of constructing vectors out of a matroid is often called the aggregation of a matroid (see, e.g, [3]), and is well known to lead to the integral points of a base polytope of a polymatroid (see [3] and [8, Volume B]). This shows that $\bar{B}_G$ is indeed a polymatroid base polytope. Furthermore, optimization over $\bar{B}_G$ can simply be done by optimizing over M, using the greedy algorithm. More precisely, for a weight function $w \in \mathbb{Z}^V$, a maximum weight point in $\bar{B}_G$ is obtained by finding a maximum weight spanning tree in G' after contracting $\bar{E}$ and by assigning, for $v \in V$, to each edge in K_v a weight equal to $w(v)$. □

Consider the polymatroid $\bar{P}_G$ that corresponds to the base polytope $\bar{B}_G$, i.e.,

$$\bar{P}_G = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^V_{\geq 0} \mid \exists \alpha \in \bar{B}_G \text{ with } x \leq \alpha\}.$$

We finish the proof of Theorem 2.4 by showing that P_G is the (polymatroidal) dual of $\bar{P}_G$. More precisely, McDiarmid [5] (see also [8, Volume B, Section 44.6f]) introduced the following notion of a dual of a polymatroid, say $\bar{P}_G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^V$. Consider a vector $y \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $\bar{P}_G$ is contained in the box $[0, y]$; we choose $y = \deg -\mathbf{1}$. Then the set of all points $y - \alpha$ for $\alpha \in \bar{P}_G$ correspond to the bases of a polymatroid, which is called the *dual* of $\bar{P}_G$ with respect to y. By (1), the vectors $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V$ obtained by taking any integral point $\alpha \in \bar{B}_G$ and setting $\mu = \deg -\mathbf{1} - \alpha$ correspond precisely to the maximal vertices of P_G as defined in Theorem 2.4. Hence, P_G is the dual of $\bar{P}_G$ with respect to y, and thus a polymatroid. Moreover, analogous to matroid duality, we can efficiently optimize over P_G because we can efficiently optimize over $\bar{P}_G$ (see [8, Volume B] for details).

3 Containment of k-trails

We first prove the hardness result claimed in Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3: We give a reduction to the Hamiltonian path problem in cubic graphs which is known to be NP-complete. First we prove the theorem for $k = 2$. We claim a cubic graph G contains a 2-trail if and only if G contains a Hamiltonian path. Indeed if G contains a Hamiltonian path $G' = (V, E')$, then the Hamiltonian path G' certifies that G contains a 2-trail with ϕ given by the identity map between the vertices of G' and G.

Now, suppose that G contains a 2-trail and let $G' = (V, U)$ be a 2-trail contained in G with *minimum* number of edges. Let $H = (W, F)$ be a 2-tree, i.e., a Hamiltonian path, and $\phi : W \to V$ certify that G' is a 2-trail. Let w be one of the two leaves in H and $v = \phi(w)$ and $(w, w') \in F$. If $|\phi^{-1}(v)| > 1$, then we can consider $\hat{H} = H \setminus \{w\}$ and restrict ϕ to $W \setminus \{w\}$. It is straightforward to see that $\hat{G} = (V, U \setminus \{\phi(w), \phi(w')\}$ is a 2-trail with possible preimage $\hat{H}$, thus contradicting the minimality of G'. Thus for each $v \in V$, if $|\phi^{-1}(v)| \geq 2$ then $\phi^{-1}(v)$ does not contain a leaf of H. But the degree of v is three and if $|\phi^{-1}(v)| \geq 2$ then at least one of the vertices in $\phi^{-1}(v)$ must be a leaf. This implies that ϕ is one to one and G' is a Hamiltonian path as well.

Consider any $k \geq 3$. We now reduce it to the $k = 2$ case. Again consider any cubic graph $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$. For each vertex $v \in \tilde{V}$, we introduce a new set of vertices v_i, $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ and connect them to v via the edge (v, v_i). We let the new graph be $G = (V, E)$ where $V = \tilde{V} \cup X$, with X denoting the new vertices introduced. We now claim that G has a k-trail if and only if $\tilde{G}$ contains a 2-trail. Let $H = (W, F)$ denote the k-tree and $\phi : W \to V$ be such that $\bar{G} = (V, U)$ be the homomorphic image of H by ϕ and $U \subseteq E$. Since every vertex $v \in X$ is a leaf in G, it must also be a leaf in $\bar{G}$. Thus $|\phi^{-1}(v)| = 1$ and if $\{w\} = \phi^{-1}(v)$, then w is also a leaf in H. Thus deleting $\phi(X)$ from H keeps it connected. Let $H' = (W', F')$ be the connected graph obtained by deleting $\phi(X)$ from H. Restricting ϕ to W', we obtain a map $\phi' : W' \to \tilde{V}$. Let $G' = (\tilde{V}, U')$ denote the image of H' by ϕ' where $U' \subseteq \tilde{E}$. We claim that H' is a Hamiltonian path. Suppose for sake of contradiction that there exists a vertex $w \in W'$ of degree at least three in H'. Let $v = \phi'(w) \in \tilde{V}$. Since v has degree three in $\tilde{G}$, it must have degree exactly three in G' and moreover, $|\phi^{-1}(v)| = 1$. But then in H, the sole vertex in $\phi^{-1}(v_i)$ must be be connected to w as well since w is the only vertex in $\phi^{-1}(v)$. Since there are $k-2$ such vertices v_i, we obtain that the degree of w in H is at least $3 + k - 2 = k + 1$ which is a contradiction. Thus we obtain that H is a Hamiltonian path and therefore, $\tilde{G}$ contains a 2-trail, completing the proof. □

To complement the hardness result, we prove Theorem 1.4 which implies that we can approximate the minimum k such that G contains a k-trail by an additive one.

Proof of Theorem 1.4: Let $G' = (V, U)$ denote a k-trail contained in G with maximum number of edges. Let $H = (W, F)$ denote a k-tree and let $\phi : W \to V$ be an onto function such that G' is the ϕ-homomorphic image of H.

Claim 2. *$G \setminus U$ is acyclic.*

Proof of Claim 2. Suppose for sake of contradiction, there is a cycle $C \in G \setminus U$. We will augment G' to a k-trail which also includes all edges of C. Let $C = (v_1, \ldots, v_r)$ where $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$ where we let $v_{r+1} = v_1$. Let $w_i \in \phi^{-1}(v_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. Introduce a new vertex u_i for each $1 \leq i \leq r$, and let $W' = W \cup \{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$ and $F' = F \cup \{\{w_i, u_{i+1}\} : 1 \leq i \leq r\}$. Moreover, we extend ϕ to ϕ' by letting $\phi'(u_i) = v_i$ for each i. It is easy to see that $G'' = (V, U \cup C)$

is an homomorphic image of $H' = (W', F')$ by $\phi' : W' \to V$. While H' is not necessarily a k-tree, Lemma 2.1 implies that there is another $\tilde{H} = (W', \tilde{F})$ such that the degree of any vertex $w \in \phi^{-1}(v)$ for $v \in C$ is at most

$$\left\lceil \frac{\deg_{G'}(v) + 2}{|\phi'^{-1}(v)|} \right\rceil \leq \left\lceil \frac{k|\phi^{-1}(v)| + 2}{|\phi^{-1}(v)| + 1} \right\rceil \leq k.$$

For any other vertex w, the degree does not change and therefore, remains at most k. This proves the claim. □

Now we will augment U to $\hat{U}$ inductively one edge at a time while maintaining two hypotheses. Firstly, $\hat{G} = (V, \hat{U})$ will be a $(k+1)$-trail. Moreover, only vertices in $\hat{H} = (\hat{W}, \hat{F})$—the preimage of $\hat{G}$—of degree $k+1$ will be isolated nodes in $G \setminus \hat{U}$. Clearly, the conditions are satisfied initially when $\hat{U} = U$ and $\hat{G} = G'$ since there are no vertices of degree $k+1$ in $\hat{H} = H$. Suppose it is true for some $\hat{U} \supseteq U$ such that $E \setminus \hat{U} \neq \emptyset$. Since $G \setminus \hat{U}$ is a forest, there exists a leaf vertex u with the only edge incident being $\{u, v\}$. We include $\{u, v\}$ in $\hat{U}$, introduce another a new vertex v' in $\hat{W}$ such that $\phi(v') = v$. Moreover, we include the edge $\{u', v'\}$ in $\hat{F}$ where $u' \in \phi^{-1}(u)$. By induction hypothesis, u' must have had degree k initially and after the introduction of the edge $\{u', v'\}$, its degree increases to $k+1$. Since u is now isolated in $G \setminus \hat{U}$ the induction hypothesis continues to hold.

Thus, after inclusion of all edges we obtain a $(k+1)$-tree such that G is the homomorphic image of the tree, proving the theorem. □

3.1 Containment of minimum weight k-trails

Now we consider the problem of finding the minimum weight k-trail contained in $G = (V, E)$ and prove Theorem 1.5. Our goal is to use the auxiliary graph $G' = (V', E')$ described in the proof of Theorem 1.2 for the recognition algorithm. Recall that edges in E are in one-to-one correspondence with $\bar{E} \subseteq E'$. We extend the weight function $w : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ to all edges in E', where $e \in \bar{E}$ gets the same weight as the corresponding edge in E. The rest of the edges in $E' \setminus \bar{E}$ are assigned weight 0. Recall, V'_v denotes the set of vertices introduced for vertex v and K_v denote the complete graph on V'_v. Identical to Property 1, we state the following property. With a slight abuse of notation, for a subgraph $\hat{G} = (V, \hat{E})$ of G, we will also denote as $\hat{E}$ the set of edges in $\bar{E}$ that correspond to $\hat{E}$.

Property 2. *Let $\hat{G} = (V, \hat{E})$ denote a subgraph of G. Let $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^V_{\geq 0}$. The following two statements are equivalent:*

(i) $\hat{G}$ is the homomorphic image of a connected graph $H = (W, F)$ of maximum degree k by an onto function $\phi : W \to V$ with $|\phi^{-1}(v)| = \mu(v) + 1 \; \forall v \in V$.

(ii) There is a spanning tree T in the auxiliary graph $G' = (V', E')$ such that $\hat{E} \subseteq T$, $|T \cap K_v| \leq |\delta_E(v)| - 1 - \mu(v) \; \forall v \in V$, and finally, $\frac{\delta_{E'}(v)}{|\delta_E(v)| - |T \cap K_v|} \leq k$.

We give a general linear programming relaxation for the problem. For any set $S \subseteq V'$ and set of edges $F \subseteq E'$, we use the notation $F(S) = \{\{u, v\} \in F : u, v \in S\}$. We introduce a variable x_e for each edge $e \in E'$. The first set of constraints enforce that x is in the convex hull of spanning trees of G'. We place *degree constraints* on $\bar{E}$-edges incident with V'_v for a well chosen subset of vertices $v \in Q$. We will initialize $Q = V$ but remove these constraints successively in later iterations. We

also write the linear program with the edge set $\hat{E} \subseteq E'$. Again we initialize $F = E'$. Property 2 implies that the following linear program is a relaxation.

$$\begin{array}{lll} \min \sum_{e \in E^*} w_e x_e & & \\ x(E^*) & = |V'| - 1 & \\ x(E^*(S)) & \leq |S| - 1 & \forall S \subseteq V', S \neq \emptyset \\ x(\delta_{E^*}(V_v)) + kx(E^*(V'_v)) & \leq k \cdot \deg_E(v) & v \in Q \\ x_e & \geq 0 & \forall e \in E \end{array} \tag{LPA}$$

We now give an algorithm based on the iterative relaxation paradigm. Iterative relaxation and related techniques have previously been applied to degree-constrained spanning tree problems [10, 2, 1, 11], and we refer the reader to [4] for further details and examples related to this technique.

1. Initialize $Q \leftarrow V$, $E^* \leftarrow E$.
2. While $Q \neq \emptyset$
   (a) Let x denote the optimal extreme point solution to LPA.
   (b) If there exists an edge $e \in E^*$ such that $x_e = 0$, then $E^* \leftarrow E^* \setminus \{e\}$.
   (c) If there exists a vertex $v \in V$ such that one of the following is satisfied

$$\deg_{E^*}(v) + (2k-1) \cdot |E^*(V_v)| \leq (2k-1) \cdot \deg_E(v) \ , \text{ or}$$
$$\deg_{E^*}(v) \leq 2k - 1 \ ,$$

   then $Q \leftarrow Q \setminus \{v\}$.
3. Return the optimal extreme point solution x^* to LPA.

Observe that when $Q = \emptyset$, then LPA optimizes over the convex hull of spanning trees of G', and therefore, x^* is an indicator of a spanning tree T of G'. Moreover, the weight of x^* is at most the weight of the initial linear programming solution since we either delete edges with zero fractional value or remove constraints. For any vertex $v \in V$, let E^* denote the fractional solution when v was removed from Q. If $\deg_{E^*}(v) \leq 2k-1$ then it follows that $\deg_T(v) \leq 2k-1$ since $T \subseteq E^*$. Moreover, because $|T(V_v)| \leq |V_v| - 1 = \deg_E(v) - 1$, following by T being a spanning tree, we have that $\deg_T(v) + (2k-1) \cdot |T(V_v)| \leq (2k-1) \cdot \deg_E(v)$, showing that the constraint for v will be fulfilled for $2k-1$ even after dropping the constraint in LPA that corresponds to v. In the other case, we also have that $\deg_T(v) + (2k-1) \cdot |T(V_v)| \leq (2k-1) \cdot \deg_E(v)$ since $T \subseteq E^*$. Thus from Property (1), it follows that T corresponds to a $(2k-1)$-trail of G of weight at most the optimal fractional value proving the theorem. It remains to prove that the algorithm is able to make progress in each iteration, which is shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let x denote the extreme point solution to LPA with edges E^* and degree constraints for $Q \subseteq V$. Then either there exists an $e \in E^*$ such that $x_e = 0$ or a vertex $v \in Q$ such that one of the following is satisfied*

$$\deg_{E^*}(v) + (2k-1) \cdot |E^*(V_v)| \leq (2k-1) \cdot \deg_E(v) \ , \ \textit{or}$$
$$\deg_{E^*}(v) \leq 2k - 1 \ .$$

The proof of Theorem 1.5 now follows from Lemma 3.1. Later in Section 3.2, we show nearly matching integrality gap examples. It remains to proof Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1: Suppose for sake of contradiction that the conditions in the lemma are not satisfied by some extreme point solution x. We consider the set of tight linear constraints defining x. Let $\tau = \{S \subseteq V' : x(E^*(S)) = |S| - 1\}$ be the tight constraints from the spanning tree constraints and let $Q_t \subseteq Q$ denote the tight degree constraints. Standard uncrossing arguments imply the following claim (see Lau, Ravi and Singh [4] Chapter 4 for details).

Claim 3. *There exists a laminar family $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \tau$ and $Q' \subseteq Q_t$ such that the following hold.*

1. $|\mathcal{L}| + |Q'| = |E^*|$.
2. *The vectors $\{\chi(E^*(S)) : S \in \mathcal{L}\} \cup \{\chi(\delta_{E^*}(V_v) + k\chi(E^*(V_v))) : v \in Q'\}$ are linearly independent.*
3. *$\{\chi(E^*(S)) : S \in \mathcal{L}\}$ span all the tight constraints corresponding to sets in $\mathcal{L}$ and $\{\chi(E^*(S)) : S \in \mathcal{L}\} \cup \{\chi(\delta_{E^*}(V_v) + k\chi(E^*(V_v))) : v \in Q'\}$ span all the tight constraints corresponding to sets in $\mathcal{L}$ and vertices in Q_t.*

We now show a contradiction by a counting argument. Observe that we have $|\mathcal{L}| \leq |V'| - 1$ since $\mathcal{L}$ is a laminar family over a ground set of size $|V'|$ and includes sets of size at least two. Let $z \in \mathbb{R}^{E^*}_{\geq 0}$ be the slack vector defined by $z_e = 1 - x_e$ for any edge $e \in E^*$. Hence, using the fact that $x(E^*) = |V'| - 1$, the total slack is bounded by

$$z(E^*) = |E^*| - x(E^*) \leq |\mathcal{L}| + |Q'| - |V'| + 1 \leq |Q'| \ .$$

Since we assume the conditions of the lemma are not satisfied and constraints for vertices in Q' are tight, the following inequality and equations follow for any $v \in W'$, where we use that $z_e + x_e = 1$ for each edge e:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{k}{2k-1}\left(\deg_{E^*}(v) + (2k-1)\cdot|E^*(V_v)|\right) &\geq \frac{k}{2k-1}\left((2k-1)\cdot\deg_E(v) + 1\right) \ \text{, and} \\
-\left(x(\delta_{E^*}(v)) + k\cdot x(E^*(V_v))\right) &= -k\cdot\deg_E(v) \ \text{, and} \\
\frac{k-1}{2k-1}(x(\delta_{E^*}(v)) + z(\delta_{E}{}^*(v))) &= \frac{k-1}{2k-1}\deg_{E^*}(v) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Adding up the left-hand sides and right-hand sides of the three relations above, we obtain that for each $v \in Q'$, we have

$$z(\delta_{E^*}(v)) + k\cdot z(E^*(V_v)) \geq \frac{k-1}{2k-1}|\delta_{E^*}(v))| + \frac{k}{2k-1} \ .$$

Since we assume that none of the two conditions of Lemma 3.1 holds, we have $\deg_{E^*}(v) \geq 2k$, and thus

$$z(\delta_{E^*}(v)) + k\cdot z(E^*(V_v)) \geq \frac{k-1}{2k-1}\cdot 2k + \frac{k}{2k-1} = k \ .$$

Summing over vertices $v \in Q'$, we get

$$\sum_{v \in Q'} (z(\delta_{E^*}(v)) + k \cdot z(E^*(V_v))) \geq k|Q'| \ .$$

Since $E^*(V_v)$ are disjoint for different vertices v, every edge is counted at most k times in the LHS and therefore it is at most $kz(E^*)$. Moreover, we have

$$z(E^*) = |E^*| - x(E^*) = |E^*| - |V'| + 1 \geq |E^*| - |\mathcal{L}| = |Q'|.$$

We obtain that

$$k|Q'| \geq kz(E^*) \geq k|Q'|$$

Thus we must have equality everywhere and, unless $k = 2$, we must have $z(\delta_{E^*}(v)) = 0$ for each $v \in Q'$ since these edges were counted at most twice. First assume $k \geq 3$ and thus we have $z(E^*(V_v)) = 1$ for each $v \in Q'$. Since $E^*(V_v)$ are disjoint, this implies that $z(E^*) \geq z(\left(\cup_{v \in Q'} E^*(V_v)\right)) = |Q'|$ which is contradiction unless $z_e = 0$ for each $e \in E^* \setminus \left(\cup_{v \in Q'} E^*(V_v)\right)$. Now, we show a linear dependence. Since $x_e = 1$ for each $e \in E^* \setminus \left(\cup_{v \in Q'} E^*(V_v)\right)$, we have that $\chi(\{e\})$ is in the span of tight constraints in $\mathcal{L}$. Subtracting these vectors from $\chi(E^*)$ we obtain that $\chi\left(\cup_{v \in Q'} E^*(V_v)\right)$ is in the span of tight constraints in τ which includes the vector $\chi(E^*)$. But this vector is also in the span of $\{\chi(\delta_{E^*}(V_v) + k\chi(E^*(V_v))) : v \in Q'\}$ and $\{\chi(\{e\}) : e \in \cup_{v \in Q'} E^*(V_v)\}$ which is a contradiction.

In the case when $k = 2$, we let $R = E^* \setminus \left(\cup_{v \in Q'} E^*(V_v)\right) \setminus \left(\cup_{v \in Q'} \delta_{E^*}(V_v)\right)$. We must have that $x_e = 1$ for each $e \in R$. But summing $\{\chi(\delta_{E^*}(V_v) + 2\chi(E^*(V_v))) : v \in Q'\}$ we obtain $2\chi(E^* \setminus R) = 2\chi(E^*) - 2\chi(R)$. Since $\chi(\{e\})$ for each $e \in R$, and $\chi(E^*)$ is in the span of tight constraints in τ and therefore, $\mathcal{L}$, we obtain a contradiction. This completes the proof of the lemma and Theorem 1.5. □

3.2 Integrality Gap Example

In this section, we give an integrality gap example for the linear program LPA. First observe that for $k = 2$, Theorem 1.5 returns a 3-trail and therefore is optimal. Now consider any integer $k \geq 3$. We show that there is an instance such that G contains no $(2k-3)$-trail but the linear program is feasible for k. In this case, the cost function is non-negative. We also show that the if the cost function is allowed to take negative values, then any trail whose cost is at most the cost of the linear programming solution must be a $(2k-2)$-trail.

Consider the cycle $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ where we have two parallel edges between v_i and v_{i+1} for each $2 \leq i \leq n-1$. Thus, v_1 has degree two, v_2 and v_n have degree three and every other vertex has degree four. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we add $2k - 1 - \deg(v)$ additional distinct vertices, say $R_i = \{w_i^1, \ldots, w_i^{b_i}\}$, and there is an edge (w, v_i) for each $w \in R_i$. Thus, the degree of each vertex is now exactly $2k-1$. Figure 4 summarizes the construction.

We consider two cost functions, first when all costs are -1. We claim there is a feasible fractional solution with degree k. We select all the edges of the graph G. It is easy to check that μ is a feasible



Figure 4: The construction of our integrality gap example. Each vertex has degree $2k-1$. Apart from vertices v_1, v_2, and v_n, all other vertices have the same number of attached pending edges, namely $2k-5$.

split vector if it has $n-1$ ones and 0 once. Thus, the degree of each vertex is $2k-1$ if it split and k or $k-1$ if it is not split. In the uniform convex combination of these integral solutions, each vertex of the will be split fractional $1-\frac{1}{n}$ units. In other words, the corresponding solution to LPA satisfies $\deg(v)-1-x(E(V'_v))=1-\frac{1}{n}$ for each ring-vertex v. One can easily verify that this implies feasibility for LPA with parameter k when $n \geq k$. Since the weights are -1 for each edge, we must include each edge in the integral solution to obtain a weight no higher than the fractional solution. Since $\mu=(1,\ldots,1)$ is not a feasible vector, we will not be able to split each vertex. But any vertex that is not split must have degree $2k-1$, giving the desired lower bound.

Now, if we restrict the weights to non-negative values, we consider the weight function which puts one on each edge. A simple check shows that no $(2k-3)$-trail is contained in G. Thus, for nonnegative weights, it remains open whether one can efficiently compute a $(2k-1)$-trail whose weight is no more than the weight of a cheapest solution of LPA for degree k.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Michel Goemans, Anupam Gupta, Neil Olver, and András Sebő for inspiring discussions. This research project started while both authors were guests at the Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics (HIM), during the 2015 trimester on Combinatorial Optimization. Both authors are very thankful to the generous support and inspiring environment provided by the HIM and the organizers of the trimester program.

References

[1] N. Bansal, R. Khandekar, J. Könemann, V. Nagarajan, and B. Peis. On generalizations of network design problems with degree bounds. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–28, 2012.

[2] N. Bansal, R. Khandekar, and V. Nagarajan. Additive guarantees for degree-bounded directed network design. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(4):1413–1431, 2009.

[3] S. Fujishige. *Submodular Functions and Optimization*. Elsevier, 2005.

[4] L. C. Lau, R. Ravi, and M. Singh. *Iterative methods in combinatorial optimization*, volume 46. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[5] C. J. H. McDiarmid. Rado's theorem for polymatroids. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 78:263–281, 1975.

[6] M. Molnár, S. Durand, and M. Merabet. A new formulation of degree-constrained spanning problems. In *Proceedings of 9th International Colloquium on Graph Theory and Combinatorics (ICGT)*, 2014. http://oc.inpg.fr/conf/icgt2014/.

[7] M. Molnár, A. Newman, and A. Sebő. Travelling salesmen on bounded degree trails, 2015. Hausdorff report (in preparation).

[8] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization, Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer, 2003.

[9] A. Sebő. Travelling salesmen on bounded degree trails. Presentation at HIM Connectivity Workshop in Bonn. Presentation is accessible online at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Do2JMhgrCM, 2015.

[10] M. Singh and L. C. Lau. Approximating minimum bounded degree spanning trees to within one of optimal. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 661–670, 2007.

[11] R. Zenklusen. Matroidal degree-bounded minimum spanning trees. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1512–1521, 2012.